

The Politics of Germany.

The peace of Europe has depended on late on the conference at Dresden. And the subject of this conference is a re-adjustment of the relations of the German states.

Since then the peace of the old world depends on the politics of Germany, and since that is the country, which, together with Ireland, furnishes the greater part of European emigration to this country, and since the political institutions of Germany resemble our own, more than any other in the world, it is both interesting and important that this country should know something of Germany. For at present there is no region of the civilized world of which we are more ignorant than that. Our knowledge of the German states of antiquity is far more exact and comprehensive.

Germany is the most intelligent, the most free, and the most prosperous of all the countries of Europe. It extends from North latitude 50 deg. to 55 deg. and from 5.30 to 20.30 of East longitude. The climate is therefore temperate, as the latitudinal line in Europe is about ten degrees North of its latitude in the United States, and the soil is fertile. The area of Germany is about 250,000 square miles—about four times as large as the State of Virginia: the population is now something over forty millions. It is watered by several hundred rivers, of which only a few are navigable; but being situated in the centre of Europe, has very imperfect access to the ocean, having but a small front on the Baltic and on the North Sea.

The greater part of the population of Germany live in cities, towns and villages, of which there are more than a hundred thousand: one hundred of the cities have over 8,000 inhabitants each. There are 24 universities with about 30,000 students—and 150 public libraries, with five or six millions of volumes. The literary activity of the people is prodigious—there being more than ten thousand authors, whose annual production is about five thousand new books. There are some four hundred journals, of which about one-third are political, and in addition there are nearly two hundred periodicals.

The population of Germany consists almost entirely of two races. The German or Teutonic numbers over thirty millions—the Slavons over six. There are about a million only of all others, Walloons, French, Jews, Italians, Gypsies, Armenians and Greeks.

But the most important distinction of Germany—those which have affected her history, politics, and condition most deeply, are religious. There are about twenty-one million of Catholics, and over eighteen of Protestants. The residue consists of Jews, Greeks, and Armenians.

Germany is a constitutional confederacy—the most populous, complicated and wonderful that ever existed. It comprehends no less than thirty-nine sovereign and independent States entirely differing in creed, size, power, and institutions. Austria is the most powerful member of the system, having a territory in Germany of over 85,000 square miles, and a population of nearly twelve millions. On the other hand there is Liechtenstein with fifty-one square miles of territory, and a population of about six thousand. Every form of government is comprehended in this confederacy—empires, kingdoms, duchies, electorates, principalities, republics, with every degree of power, in princes, estates, parliaments, and people. There are about fifteen absolute governments, five constitutional monarchies, fourteen in which the different orders of the State, princes, nobles, and clergy, have a sort of feudal division of power, and our republics, or free cities.

One of the most curious features of the German system is, that several of its members have large possessions independent of it. Austria has twice as much territory and population outside of the confederation as she has within. Prussia has about half as much. The King of Denmark represents Holstein and Lauenburg in the confederacy. The King of Holland holds the Duchy of Luxembourg.

The present Constitution of the German Confederacy was adopted in 1815, and is guaranteed in the treaty of Vienna by the allied powers of Europe. The federal government is vested in a Diet or Congress of the plenipotentiaries of the States, and Austria presides. This Diet is permanent, and meets at Frankfurt on the Maine, one of the free cities or States. But this Diet sits in two capacities, and with different organizations. In one capacity, that of the *Plenum*, it decides, without any discussion whatever, all questions before it. In the other it discusses, but does not decide, except as to what propositions it shall submit to the *Plenum*. In the *Plenum* every State has at least one vote, but Austria, and the five kingdoms of Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Hanover, and Wurtemberg, have each four votes; Baden, Hesse Cassel, Hesse Darmstadt, Holstein, and Luxembourg, each three; Brunswick, Mecklenburg Schwerin and Nassau, each two; the other States each one, making altogether seventy.

In making or altering fundamental laws, in the admission of new members into the Confederacy, and in religious matters, unanimity is required. The assembly, when sitting to originate and discuss propositions, is also the executive power of the confederacy. Austria presides in both. But in the deliberative assembly there are only seventeen votes allowed, and they are thus apportioned: Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Hanover, Wurtemberg, Baden, Hesse Cassel, Darmstadt, Holstein, and Luxembourg have each one vote, making eleven. The twelfth vote belongs to the Electorate of Saxony, the grand duchy and duchies of Saxony, the thirteenth to Brunswick and Nassau, the fourteenth to Mecklenburg Schwerin and Stralitz, the fifteenth to Oldenburg, the three branches of Anhalt, and the two of Schwartzburg, the sixteenth to Hohenzollern, Ronsa and Waldeck, the seventeenth to the four free cities of Hamburg, Bremen, Lubek and Frankfurt on the Maine.

The deputies or plenipotentiaries are responsible each to his own government, and only vote according to instructions.

The objects of the confederation are: 1. The independence and integrity of the states. 2. Protection of the states against each other. 3. Protection of the government of each state against its people. 4. To provide representative constitutions for all the states. 5. The

legal equality of all the Christians. & The right of emigration from any one to any other of the states and of holding property in any.

It appears from an examination of the population of the several states, that the apportionment of representation in the Diet under its deliberative and executive organization, that the majority of deputies necessary to decide, represent three-fourths of the population of Germany—one-fourth having thus the veto power, whilst in the *Plenum* the opposition of twenty-four votes is fatal to any proposition, and twenty-four votes may be given by states whose population is not one-fiftieth part of the whole. And as to the most important questions, unanimity is required. Each state is assessed at a certain contingent of troops for the armies of the confederation.

It is apparent that as a federal system, the German is in general more conservative of state rights than our own. And in fact, in the thirty-five years of the existence of the German confederation, the original rights of the states as agreed on by the compact of 1815, have been respected more religiously than with us. This results from its being less consolidated in its structure than ours.

But there are two antagonistic elements in the German confederation as in ours. With us they are the distinctions between white and black; with them the rights of princes and people.

The overthrow of Napoleon was effected by the rising of the masses of central Europe against him, on promises of liberty from their rulers. These promises were evaded, rather than fulfilled by a stipulation in the constitution of the German confederacy, that the Diet was to provide representative charters for the several States. But even this vague provision had not been observed, when, on the occurrence of the French revolution in 1830, the agitation extended to several of the German States, and, among them, the people of Hesse Cassel rose and demanded a representation of the Elector. It was agreed to. A written constitution or charter was adopted, which, among other things, reserved for the representatives of the people the right of controlling the supplies—the purse. This alarmed the Diet, which, in 1832, proceeded to prohibit the exercise of a power to withhold supplies. It does not appear that any occasion arose to bring on an actual conflict of the Diet with the Electorate on this point, as the chamber of the latter did not exercise the power it claimed until 1848—after the last French revolution, and after what may be called the German revolution. For great changes followed in Germany those which occurred in France. The people rose in Vienna, in Berlin, and in other places, and extorted constitutions. And there was, by a sort of general consent, a movement made by both princes and people to establish a new German union, instead of the confederacy of 1815. Strange as it may seem, this new movement was devoted to unity as well as to liberty. It never arrived at success, although a convention of the German States was held, not only recognized, but attended by Austria and the other powers. Its design was to consolidate Germany into one State, with a representative government. Mr. CALVOUX, in a conversation with the Prussian minister, foretold the failure of the scheme—said that the only step towards consolidation that Germany could take was to perfect the Zollverein, which is a commercial compact, comprehending most of the States of Germany, and designed to equalize duties, to collect them on the frontier, to abolish transit charges, and to remove restrictions on trade.

The scheme of a German unity, of a German empire or of a German republic failed. And reason occurred in Austria, Prussia, and every where else. It was then that Austria undertook as President to convene the old Diet at Frankfurt, and one of the main objects was to call on the forces of the confederacy to put down the people of Hesse Cassel, who had through their representatives refused to grant supplies to the elector, on a preposterous demand of an odious minister, of a large amount, for indefinite objects, contrary to the constitution.

This movement of Austria has been opposed by Prussia, which was jealous of Austrian ascendancy in the Diet. Prussia is the great Protestant, Austria the great Catholic power of Germany, and with the exception of four or five, all the lesser States have a preponderance of Protestant population. This has sustained the federative character of Germany, through the long period in which Russia in the North, and France in the South have passed from feudalism to consolidation.

Austria insists not only on convening the Diet, and presiding in it, but on bringing into the Germanic system her Hungarian and Italian provinces. It does not appear that she demands an increased representation or vote on their account, but it would result from their introduction that she would be entitled to the aid of the federal forces in keeping them in subjection, and in protecting them from foreign conquest.

On this proposition Prussia has vacillated, and Russia has vacillated. The latter is indeed not strictly a party to the dispute, except as a party to the treaty of 1815, on whose integrity she has a right to insist. And Russia has acquired an influence with Austria, especially in the management of Hungary, in consequence of the aid rendered to arrest the late revolution in that kingdom. Russia has at one time, it seems, supported the plan of Austria to re-establish the Diet, and to introduce Hungary, Lombardy, &c., into the German system. This would give to Austria the right of maintaining in Germany a larger force than now, and thus of maintaining more effectively the cause of absolute power. On the other hand, it would violate the treaty of 1815, and would, perhaps, render Austria less dependent on Russia. So, if the Austrian policy succeeds, she becomes too powerful for Prussia; but if it fails, she is tempted to maintain and improve her connection with Russia, and thus become more dangerous still. Hence the vacillating course and conflicting accounts at Dresden, of the conference which is assembled there on these important questions. At one time Austria became imperious and dogmatic in her language, and was answered by Prussia in a call on her Landwehr, the whole military force in war, of that State. The call was answered with such enthusiasm everywhere, that Austria immediately receded.

It is one of the most curious and interesting struggles of a federative with consolidated systems, that modern history affords. And on the firmness and sagacity of Germany in maintaining her peculiar system, depends all of liberty of which continental Europe is capable.

The Foreign Element in Boston.

In our editorial of yesterday, we referred to the fact of the preponderance of the foreign element in the population of the "loyal" city of Boston. Striking proofs of this have already been adduced by us in previous numbers of this paper, but we find such conclusive confirmation of the fact in the Boston Journal of March 21st, that we cannot forbear citing it, to clinch the matter beyond the possibility of dispute. Here is the admission, coupled with the complaint of one of their own leading journals. Dispute it who dare.

Immigration.—The great evil of the day to this city is the continued influx of foreigners, who, flying from the low wages and poverty of Ireland, pour upon our shores in numbers to which there appears to be no limit. To this immense immigration Boston acts like a sieve—the enterprising, industrious, and those who have means, pass through and seek their fortune elsewhere, while the lazy, the vicious, and the idle remain—a constantly accumulating dead weight.

For the following statistics upon this subject we are indebted to that very interesting and able work, "The Report of the Sanitary Commission of Massachusetts"—a work, let us say in passing, which should be carefully read by every man who has to pay taxes—by every selfish man who thinks and looks only to his own interest and welfare, and by every benevolent man who wishes to do what he may for the benefit of his race.

The increase of our foreign population in the five years since 1846, is 26,031, against a decrease of 1879 native. Showing that foreigners have actually crowded the natives beyond the city limits. The births in Boston in 1849 were 62 per cent. foreign, and 38 per cent. native, although the ratio of population was 46 foreign, to 54 native.

Boston has paid in the last five years about \$350,000 per annum for the support of schools, one-half of which goes for her foreign population, making the sum of \$875,000 expended for this purpose within that time, and yet there are more than a thousand of these foreign children prowling about our streets night and day, who have not been got into our schools, and who are earning an apprenticeship for the house of correction and the State prison.

The Boston Society for the Prevention of Pauperism has received in the past five years applications for employment from 15,697 females, of whom 14,044 were foreigners, and out of 8,602 male applicants 5,034 were foreigners.

The whole number of persons relieved as paupers in the county of Suffolk in 1849 was 7,728, of whom 4,549 were foreigners. The whole number of paupers in the State in the same year was 24,892, of whom 10,253 were foreigners. The whole amount expended for the support of foreign paupers by the State in 1849 was \$123,311, and by the towns, exclusive of repayments for the State, a further sum sufficient to make the aggregate at least \$300,000. The whole number of foreign paupers in the State in 1833 was 2,765. The increase in ten years was two hundred and sixty-eight per cent.

Boston is building an almshouse at Deer Island at a cost of \$150,000, and a new jail at a cost of \$600,000 for the accommodation of foreigners—neither would be required for our native population.

Of 1170 dram shops in Boston, in 1849, 800 were kept by foreigners, for the sale of the vilest of liquors, and the number of inmates of the State prison of increasing the number of tenants for the new jail and almshouse.

About three-fourths of all arrests, of all commitments to the County jail, and of all cases before the police and municipal courts, are foreigners.

The number of persons committed in the House of Correction in Boston, in 1849, was 3,737, of whom 2,348 were foreigners. The number committed in the whole State in 1849 was 3,065, of which 1,770 were foreigners.

The great increase of crime in the State within the last eight years, has been altogether among the foreign population. Notwithstanding the increase in numbers of the native inhabitants, the number of commitments among them has not increased.

One-third of all the inmates of the State prison for the last twenty years, have been foreigners, and the State is now expending \$100,000 to receive their accommodations.

Of 327 admissions to the Lunatic Hospital in Boston, in six years, 160 were foreigners.

For nine years the Boston Dispensary has had under its care 29,008 cases, of which 15,522 were foreigners. In 1849 it had 3,950, of which 3,487 were foreigners.

At the Almshouse on Deer Island, from 1847 to Jan. 1, 1850, the number of paupers admitted was 4,816, of whom 4,661 were foreigners. The number remaining on the 1st of Jan. was 402, of whom 369 were foreigners.

In 1849 the deaths by cholera in Boston were 707, of whom 573 were foreigners.

The whole number of persons who died in Boston in 1849 was 5,079, of whom 2,982 were foreigners—being 59 foreign to 41 native, in a population 46 foreign to 54 native.

These are startling facts, and every one of them—crime, pauperism, births and deaths—goes to show that the immigrants who remain with us are a population of the very worst description. They are facts, too, which demand serious consideration. Are we willing that our city and State shall be made one great almshouse for the reception and support of all the paupers of Great Britain and Ireland, and a place of refuge for the rascals and thieves of the old world? And if not, what can be done to prevent it?

That these evils—crime and pauperism—are increased by every immigration of foreigners, does not admit of a doubt. That they are offset by no corresponding benefit, is equally clear.—To the immigration of the honest, the intelligent, the prudent and industrious, we open our doors wide, for all such can make their own way somewhere in our broad land, and will rather be a benefit than a burden to the country; but why should we be compelled to find almshouses, jails, courts and hospitals, for the idle, the profligate, the depraved, the ignorant and insane?

The evil is apparent—the remedy not so clear. Yet it seems to us that something may be done by a vigorous enforcement of the alien passenger law, in requiring bonds and exacting penalties. Something may be done by closing up the eight hundred dram-shops, and something still further by clearing our streets of vagrant children, and compelling them to attend the day schools. One thing is certain: whatever remedies we have in our hands should be promptly and vigorously applied, for the good of the foreign as well as of the native population.

More Dissatisfaction in Virginia.

Another of the Virginia papers, the *Southside Democrat*, repudiates the resolutions of repudiation passed by the legislature. We extract the entire article:

"In reading the report of the debate in the Senate, and the resolutions submitted for Mr. Scott by the Committee of Thirteen, we are pleased to find that the senator from the Dinwiddie district, dissented from the second of the series and proposed an amendment. It will be remembered that the second resolution referred to the notorious Compromise, as an adjustment of the grievances and complaints of the South. We had supposed a proposition was too much for any Southern stomach, but it seems the legislature could swallow it. In truth, nothing is more fluctuating than public opinion. Beyond question nine-tenths of the people of Virginia were opposed, out and out, to the Compromise. But their representatives contracted by solemn league and covenant, that they should submit: and more, made the people of Virginia smack their lips, as if they had taken in something pleasant to the palate. Public opinion, or rather politicians are fluctuating, as may be seen by comparing the resolutions of '47, with the resolutions of '51. But there were some men in the legislature who could not so stultify themselves as to pronounce the Compromise a satisfactory settlement of the wrongs of the South. Among these was Dr. Thompson of Dinwiddie. He moved the following substitute to the second resolution of the committee, and sustained it by the remarks of which we give merely an outline:

"The question being on the adoption of the 2d resolution, Mr. Thompson offered the following amendment:

Resolved, That in the absence of any authentic expression of opinion by the people of this Commonwealth on the subject, the general assembly deem it unwise to recommend the sending of delegates to the proposed Southern Congress.

Mr. Thompson of Dinwiddie, said that he did not intend to discuss the unhappy train of events which had brought the country to its present perilous condition. The time for discussion had passed. His object was to state his position. He stood now where he did in 1846-'47, and he had no authority to say that his constituents occupied a different position, upon the vexed question between the North and South, from that then taken by the legislature and sanctioned by the State. That he was not prepared to give an expression of their wishes and sentiments upon the late compromise measures—and, therefore, he would not do it by implication, heaving resolutions under consideration, for which he proposed a substitute to sanction them. He had no authority to say the people of his district were, or were not disposed, to meet South Carolina in a Southern Congress; and, in the absence of all information, he would leave that matter entirely to the people. He concurred in the spirit of the resolutions: and if so modified as to meet the views of all parties, which might be done, they would meet with the approbation of the legislature, and South Carolina, and restore peace to the country; for he did not think we had reached the point of disunion; and forbearance had not yet ceased to be a virtue."

It will be seen that Mr. Thompson's substitute abandons the proposition that the Compromise was just to the South. Mr. Thompson expressed his confidence in the general spirit of the resolutions, but objects to this particular proposition. And we assert that in this he is sustained by the unanimous opinion of those who elected him to the Senate. If anybody thinks the Doctor has misrepresented the sentiments of his constituents, let him undertake to oppose the Doctor in the next election. That is the best way of settling the question. Let some unscrupulous opponent should charge the Doctor with disunion; we call attention to his positive denial of the accusation. "We have not yet reached the point of disunion; forbearance has not yet ceased to be a virtue."

Mississippi and Virginia.

The students of the Virginia University may well feel proud of the commendation of their course, which is conveyed in the greeting of the Central Association of Mississippi, which will be found below.

The names attached to that document give it a weight and a significance which such documents seldom carry with them, for the gallant Whig governor of the State, GEN. HAYS, heads the list, which contains also names equally well known and respected.

University of Virginia, April 3, 1851.

To the Editors of the Southern Press:

GENTLEMEN: In accordance with instructions from the Southern Rights Association of the University of Virginia, we herewith transmit to you for publication, the brief but eloquent address from the "Central Southern Rights Association of Mississippi, to the Southern Rights Association of the University of Virginia."

A. E. H. BANKS, Corresponding Secretary.

The Central Southern Rights Association of Mississippi, to the Southern Rights Association of the University of Virginia:

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN: With the deepest pleasure and highest pride we perceive your organization, your address to the young men of the South, and your resolutions; and we cannot forbear sending you our ardent gratulation.

We have nothing addulatory to offer. We would say simply what we think and feel. Your just and clear conception of the rapacities and spoliation perpetrated—never to be endured—by the greater outrage committed, by the sense of the present degradation and peril of the South; and the spirit you pledge for retributive and for future safety—all come opportunely to cheer the heart and illumine the prospect of every patriot.

We rejoice that you have, in your *Alma Mater*, put on the toga virilis, and that it is not to become a garment of degeneracy and subordination. Remembered be the words of your day opens. Take charge of the wrongs and indignities of the South, to redress them, and look to her coming destinies.

You will take counsel of your senior patriots, who are in the arena; but we ask you not to permit TAZEWELL and CHRYLES to leave us in despair; but bring up to them, in their last hallooed hours, the Southern people united! Mississippi united!

In conclusion of this brief address, allow us to say, that if Virginia shall act upon the repeated resolutions of her legislature, and assume and take and keep the lead of the assailed States, all will be well—the South will unite—the compact of the States will be restored—and the hopeful Union which it formed, sent onward to future generations; but all this depends on the future action of Virginia.

JACKSON, February 15, 1851.

J. S. GUION, President.

CHAS. DUDLEY, Vice Presidents.

WM. F. AUSTIN, M. HOMER SMYTHE, C. P. RUSSELL, A. HUTCHINSON, C. S. TAPLEY, T. J. MARLTON, E. BARNARD, RICH. GRIFFITH, Treasurer.

D. N. BARROWS, JAMES McDONALD, R. DICKSON, JAMES C. NARON, J. BELL, GEO. M. L. SMITH, J. S. DAVENPORT, J. S. FITZPATRICK, Recording Secretaries.

Corresponding Committee.

Executive Committee.

Sentiment in South Carolina.

The Blackriver Watchman makes the following comments on a recent letter of Mr. POSTHUMPT, who did not republish, because it was merely a rehash of the old arguments, of the Anti States Rights Submissionists:

This letter contains a very fair specimen of submissionist argument. Mr. Posthumpt denies that the South has received any wrong from the federal government, and denies the right of secession by any single State, and of course by any number of States; and what is very strange, he professes to find for this last position some support from the fact that the legislature of this State thought fit at its last session to provide the means of enforcing that right, as if a party in power would always yield to clear and undisputed right. Mr. Posthumpt has, as usual, attempted to give weight to this argument upon questions of right, by an appeal to the pockets and the fears of the people of this State. His estimate of the costs of a collision with the general government, or the preparation for collision, presents an array of figures which is truly formidable to all who are prepared for submission to all hazards, but of little consequence to freemen, who know their rights, and knowing dare maintain them. He has taken some pains to depict, what he supposed to be an illusion, from the minds of the people of this State, and had scarcely succeeded, when lo! to his imagination a grim monster presents itself, in the form of a British and French abolitionism, which, in his fancy, is preparing to scatter "arrows, fire-brands and death" over our devoted land, and exclaims "ought we not to pause before we withdraw ourselves from the protecting arm which now shelters us?" The protecting arm of the general government! The culture protects the lamb, but protects it to devour it.

This letter is a very fair summary of submissionist doctrines, and they may be stated briefly thus:

1. A denial of all State rights.

2. A belief in the infallibility of Congress, and complete satisfaction with its conduct, past, present and future.

3. A little love of money, and a little fear of danger.

On the opposite side stand in bold and strong array those who believe,

1st. In the right of secession by one, or any number of States.

2d. That the South has been wronged, deeply, willfully, and unconstitutionally.

3d. That the future is full of danger, instead of protection from the federal government.

4. That the only remedy is secession.

With regard to this last article of political faith, there is not a slight difference as to time and mode; but a difference which can and will be easily reconciled. Secession by the Southern States for the formation of a new confederacy is the object to be attained, and if South Carolina remains in the Union, it is for the purpose of procuring co-operation; and if she secedes alone, it is because circumstances render it necessary for her to lead off as a forlorn hope, soon to be followed by others into the thickest of the contest.

The Georgetown (S. C.) Observer thus briefly refers to the Virginia resolutions:

The late action of the Virginia legislature, approving of the principles of the so-called compromise, and giving good advice to the poor benighted State of South Carolina, has doubtless been the occasion of great rejoicing with the submissionists, and dis-unionists of the South. But when it is borne in mind, that in occupying the position that she now does, South Carolina has maintained her consistency in opposing the resolutions of Virginia of an earlier date, and more manly and patriotic character, the advice, it does seem, comes with a very ill-grace, and is only entitled to scorn and rejection.

The Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser thus responds to some of "the surmises and assumptions" of the Greenville Patriot, which have been so greedily snatched up by the "national" organs here and elsewhere. Those papers will please correct:

SOUTHERN PATRIOT.—In a recent number of this paper, we noticed an article headed "State Convention," which, as usual, abounds in surmises and assumptions. Gentlemen, you struggle in vain, if you can make no better showing than an array of mere suppositions. We only notice that part which alludes to Edgefield. Col. Jenkins is not an anti-secessionist, and "without cause" (as you phrase it) we will undertake to make the same assertion of Chas. Wardlaw. If he is in the category in which you place him, you know more of him than the people who elected him.

Slavery in Liberia.

We find the following curious statement in the *Albany Atlas*. It throws some light on a dark place:

A singular account of "Dahomey and the Dahomans," has appeared, written by T. F. Forbes, a lieutenant in her Majesty's service. On the last day of May, the king of Dahomey makes presents to his people. He stands on a raised platform, and occupies himself for many hours in throwing cloth, linens, and corvins to the assembled thousands of naked blacks below, who scramble for them. The last of the gifts consists of live prisoners, who are exhibited in gay dresses, and tied hand and foot, are flung down to the waiting savages below, who instantly tear them to pieces. The mission of Lieutenant Forbes to Gezo, the king of Dahomey, was to induce him to discontinue the slave trade, but this object was not attained. The king urged that it was impossible on many grounds, such as national habit and expediency, example of his ancestors, &c., &c. Lieutenant Forbes says that slavery actually prevails, under another name in Liberia. The negroes are called *pawns*, and are taken as payment for debts. Almost every English merchant in Liberia has a *femme du pays*, and she manages his establishment. She does so by selling goods to native merchants, who leave slaves or pawns in payment. Lieut. Forbes says he knew a *femme du pays*, who had forty pawns, who performed all the household duties, and who were in fact, slaves.

PHOTOGRAPHS.—The *Albany Argus* thus chronicles the latest and most important proof of Boston "loyalty":

A GOOD SYMPTOM, AND IN THE RIGHT QUARTER.—It will be seen by our telegraph report that the Massachusetts legislature, by a decisive vote, refused the use of the State House yard to certain petitioners who wished to hold therein a meeting of those opposed to the Fugitive slave law.

This is certainly an encouraging index of the growing feeling in the old Bay State in favor of sustaining the law of the land, in opposition to that portion of her citizens (hitherto deemed large) who would trample the law and the Constitution under foot. We hail it as an additional good omen from that quarter.

The vote by which the yard was refused, stood 147 to 113.

And this, who can doubt the "soundness" of the body who did elect RANTOUL, and came within twelve of electing SUMNER!

The Ohio papers are still squabbling as to the superior abolition orthodoxy of their respective parties.

The Statesman, (Dem.) thus hits the Journal (Whig):

How is THAT!—The Whig press of Ohio, professing to be opposed to slavery beyond all other parties on earth, or elsewhere, are doing every thing they dare to render C. M. Clayriden the banner of emancipation in Kentucky. Witness the Ohio State Journal, Scioto Gazette, &c., &c., &c.

The Mammoth Monthlies.

We give to-day, in another column, some extracts from the New York Herald on *Harper's Monthly*, and the *International Magazine*—the "Mammoth Monthlies," as they modestly designate themselves in huge placards stuck in the windows of the book-stores.

The article is in the usual slipshod, slipshod style of the Herald critiques, and contains some sensible suggestions, mixed up with others which we conceive to be frivolous and uncalled-for.

In the main, however, we concur with the estimate of the literary merits of these journals expressed by the Herald; for the late numbers of both have been so trashy, and have fallen so far below the promises of the prospectus, and the performance of the editors in the earlier issues, as to be beneath criticism. The only wonder is, that persons having access to such a variety of foreign publications, from all of which they are free to plier *ad libitum*, should have shown so little judgment or taste in the guidance of their scissors, and have clipped out the most trivial and uninteresting of the contributions, to cram down the throats of a gaping public.

The sins of omission, however, are not the worst of which we have to complain; for, as the Herald justly remarks, the management of these monthly scrap-books has evidently been confided to prejudiced, as well as incompetent or idle hands. The monthly summary of political news, (especially in *Harper's*) is grossly partial and parizan in its coloring and suppression of facts, and calculated to convey false impressions. It is a kind of masked battery, from which the Northern artillery is far away unseen and unsuspected by those who are watching other points from which the enemy is assailing Southern rights.

We deem this a fraud upon the public; and caution our Southern friends to beware of this new device of the enemy. If they doubt the correctness of this statement, let them turn to the back numbers of these journals, and they will be able to verify the allegation to their entire content.

We feel bound to make this expose, because we expressed our satisfaction, on the issue of the earlier numbers of both these publications, that the picture books for grown-up children, such as *Godey's* and *Graham's Magazines*, were about to be superseded by a superior type of monthly magazines, containing the cream of the foreign periodicals—and as our expectations have been disappointed, must make the *amende* to our readers.

If we are to choose only between home and foreign trivialities, we give the preference to the domestic article—more especially when political poison is mingled with the honey proffered by the former. We have carefully examined each successive issue of these serials, which have gradually descended an inclined plane, "from fair to middling," until at last they cannot even be counted "ordinary." "Light reading" they do undoubtedly supply: for the very whiff of foreign artists is served up to sate the edge of the hungry appetites of the sixty thousand readers which *Harper's* boasts of. The *International*, candor compels us to say, is rather more substantial, and may claim the consistency of literary custard.

The cheapness of these publications is held out as an inducement; but trash is dear if obtained gratis: for time is a precious thing, and mental dissipation a dangerous disease, to the young especially. For our own moments of leisure and mental relaxation, we would prefer one number of the unprinted and untruncated *Southern Literary Messenger*, of Richmond, to a cart load of these mammoth monthlies; to those who glean from foreign periodicals, to those who take the *British Quarterly*, and *Blackwood*, we commend *Littell's Living Age*, published at Boston, by a veteran purveyor, who understands the foreign market.

Such is our candid opinion of these "Mammoth"; but whether they will consider this a "first rate notice," we know not. At all events, it has the rare merit of perfect sincerity, and may therefore be relied on, even if the proprietors of those journals do not choose to take the hint, and insist on a more careful selection of articles, or more competent conductors. The serials stories, which they stuff into every issue, are in themselves an abominable imposition on the pockets and the patience of the public, though they may profit the producer. If these things be not speedily rectified, these "Mammoth" will soon be classed among other extinct species.

The Cost of the "Glorious Triumph" in Rhode Island.

The political kettle-drums have been beaten most lustily in honor of the recent "triumph of correct principles" in Rhode Island. The Providence Journal thus puts the matter on a pecuniary basis:

"We referred yesterday to the unprecedented amount of money spent by our opponents in the election. Nothing like it was ever seen before in Rhode Island. Never before was bribery so liberal, never so slight temptation to a man who probably did not earn two hundred dollars a year, and eighty dollars was given for a single vote. Twenty dollars was a common price, and forty and fifty dollars were paid for single votes in many instances. It is the opinion of those best able to judge, that the election has cost our opponents not less than